

REMARKS

In response to the Final Office action dated September 6, 2007, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above amendments and following remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as amended are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-4, 8-19 and 21-25 are pending in the present application. Claims 8, 9, 12, 13, 15 and 22-25 have been previously withdrawn from consideration, and claims 5-7, 20, 26 and 27 have been previously canceled, leaving claims 1-4, 10, 11, 14, 16-19 and 21 for consideration upon entry of the present amendments and following remarks.

Claims 1, 17 and 18 have been amended. Support for the amendment to independent claims 1 and 18 may be found at least on page 18, lines 3-5 and pages 19-27 of the application as originally filed. Claim 17 has been amended to correct grammatical errors.

No new matter has been added. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested in view of the above amendment and following remarks.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-4, 10, 11, 14, 16-19 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Suzuki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,600,462, hereinafter "Suzuki") in view of Kojima (U.S. Patent No. 6,011,601, hereinafter "Kojima"). The Examiner states that Suzuki discloses all of the elements of claims 1-4, 14 and 16-17 except, *the refractive index of the prism sheet is in a range from about 1.41 to about 1.49*, which the Examiner further states would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, and *the light incident surface is substantially smooth*, which the Examiner further states is disclosed primarily in FIG. 2 of Kojima.

The Examiner states that Suzuki discloses all of the elements of claims 10 and 11 except, *the light emission angle is in a range from about 5.86° to about 26.23° and that the inclined surfaces are configured such that the light incident on one of the inclined surfaces travels in accordance with the claimed equations 1 to 3*, which the Examiner further states would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

The Examiner states that Suzuki discloses all of the elements of claims 18, 19 and 21 except, *the refractive index of the prism sheet is in a range from about 1.41 to about 1.49*, which the Examiner further states would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, and *the light incident surface is substantially smooth*, which the Examiner further states is disclosed primarily in FIG. 2 of Kojima. . Applicants respectfully traverse for at least the reason set forth below.

First, it is respectfully noted that independent claims 1 and 18 have been amended to recite, *inter alia*, wherein a peak angle between the two inclined surfaces is selected to be in a range from about 90° to about 120° based on a refraction index of the prism sheet, wherein the refraction index of the prism sheet is in a range from about 1.41 to about 1.49

In contrast, it is respectfully noted that Suzuki simply gives a range of peak angles for a refraction index of 1.5. (See col. 4, lines 21-26). Suzuki does not teach or suggest that the peak angle is selected to be in a certain range based on a refraction index of the prism sheet. Suzuki instead gives a refraction index of 1.5 to realize a large critical angle from the optical film material 9 to the air, and does not suggest any relationship between the refraction index and the peak angle. (See col. 4, lines 21-26).

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Suzuki does not teach or suggest, and in fact teaches away from, a prism sheet wherein a peak angle between the two inclined surfaces is selected to be in a range from about 90° to about 120° based on a refraction index of the prism sheet, wherein the refraction index of the prism sheet is in a range from about 1.41 to about 1.49...., as recited in amended independent claims 1 and 18.

Kojima fails to cure the defects of Suzuki as described above, namely, Kojima also does not teach or suggest a prism sheet wherein a peak angle between the two inclined surfaces is selected to be in a range from about 90° to about 120° based on a refraction index of the prism sheet, wherein the refraction index of the prism sheet is in a range from about 1.41 to about 1.49...., as recited in amended independent claims 1 and 18. Thus, independent claims 1 and 18, including claims depending therefrom, i.e., claims 2-4, 10, 11, 14, 16-19 and 21, define over Suzuki in view of Kojima.

In addition, it is respectfully submitted that both Suzuki and Kojima disclose an edge-illumination type LCD apparatus having a lamp disposed at a side of a light guide as illustrated

in FIG. 3. In contrast, the present invention includes a direct-illumination type LCD apparatus having lamps disposed ... opposite to a side at which the prism sheet is disposed, as recited in amended claim 18. Thus, Suzuki, Kojima, or any combination thereof, do not teach or disclose the features of the present invention as claimed in amended independent claim 18.

Thus, independent claim 18, including claims depending therefrom, i.e., claims 19 and 21, define over Suzuki and Kojima, for at least this additional reason.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the relevant rejection of claims 1-4, 10, 11, 14, 16-19 and 21 under § 103(a) is thus respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is cordially requested to telephone the undersigned.

In the event the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks deems additional fees to be due in connection with this application, Applicants' attorney hereby authorizes that such fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Applicants hereby petition for any necessary extension of time required under 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a) or 1.136(b) which may be required for entry and consideration of the present Reply.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: /James J. Merrick/
James J. Merrick
Reg. No. 43,801
John W. Stankiewicz
Reg. No. 60,169
Confirmation No. 8547
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
PTO Customer No. 23413
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Facsimile (860) 286-0115

Date: October 24, 2007